

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

AMY W. SCHULMAN
DLA PIPER LLP
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020
Telephone: (212) 335-4500
Facsimile: (212) 335-4501
amy.schulman@dlapiper.com

STUART M. GORDON (SBN: 037477)
GORDON & REES LLP
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Facsimile: (415) 986-8054
sgordon@gordonrees.com

MICHAEL C. ZELLERS (SBN: 146904)
TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2223
Telephone: (213) 430-3400
Facsimile: (213) 430-3409
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com

Attorneys for Defendants
PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION,
AND G.D. SEARLE LLC

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE BEXTRA AND CELEBREX
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

This document relates to

OLIVE BEEBE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PFIZER, INC., PHARMACIA CORPORATION,
G.D. SEARLE LLC, (FKA G.D. SEARLE & CO.),
and MONSANTO COMPANY,

Defendants.

) MDL Docket No. 1699

) CASE NO. 3:08-cv-0977-CRB

) **PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA**
) **CORPORATION, AND G.D.**
) **SEARLE LLC'S ANSWER TO**
) **COMPLAINT**

) **JURY DEMAND ENDORSED**
) **HEREIN**

1 NOW COME Defendants Pfizer Inc. (improperly captioned in Plaintiffs' Complaint as
2 "Pfizer, Inc.") ("Pfizer"), Pharmacia Corporation (formerly known as "Monsanto Company"¹)
3 ("Pharmacia"), and G.D. Searle LLC ("Searle"), (collectively "Defendants") and file their
4 Answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint ("Complaint"), and would respectfully show the Court as
5 follows:

6 **I.**

7 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

8 The Complaint does not state in sufficient detail when Plaintiffs were prescribed or used
9 Celebrex® (celecoxib) ("Celebrex®"). Accordingly, this Answer can only be drafted
10 generally. Defendants may seek leave to amend this Answer when discovery reveals the
11 specific time periods in which Plaintiffs were prescribed and used Celebrex®.

12 **II.**

13 **ANSWER**

14 **Response to Allegations Regarding Parties**

15 1. Defendants admit that Plaintiffs brought this civil action seeking monetary damages, but
16 deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief or damages. Defendants admit that, during certain
17 periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United
18 States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in
19 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of
20 time, Celebrex® were manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested,
21 marketed, co-promoted, and distributed Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by
22 healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their
23 approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used

24 _____
25 ¹ Plaintiffs' Complaint names "Monsanto Company" as a Defendant. Defendants state that in 1933, an entity known
26 as Monsanto Company ("1933 Monsanto") was incorporated under the laws of Delaware. On March 31, 2000, 1933
27 Monsanto changed its name to Pharmacia Corporation. On February 9, 2000, a separate company, Monsanto Ag
28 Company, was incorporated under the laws of Delaware. On March 31, 2000, Monsanto Ag Company changed its
name to Monsanto Company ("2000 Monsanto"). The 2000 Monsanto is engaged in the agricultural business and
does not and has not ever designed, produced, manufactured, sold, resold or distributed Celebrex®. Given that
Plaintiffs allege in their Complaint that Monsanto Company was involved in distributing Celebrex®, see
PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT at ¶ 7, Defendants assume Plaintiffs mean to refer to 1933 Monsanto. As a result,
Pharmacia will respond to the allegations directed at Monsanto Company.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the
2 potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved
3 prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable
4 standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused
5 Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the
6 Complaint.

7 2. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
8 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiff's age, citizenship,
9 medical condition, and whether Plaintiff used Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same.
10 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,
11 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 3. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
13 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiff's age, citizenship,
14 medical condition, and whether Plaintiff used Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same.
15 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,
16 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

17 4. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
18 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiff's age, citizenship,
19 medical condition, and whether Plaintiff used Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same.
20 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiff injury or damage,
21 and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 5. Defendants admit that Pfizer is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of
23 business in New York. Defendants admit that, as the result of a merger in April 2003,
24 Pharmacia became a subsidiary of Pfizer. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph
25 of the Complaint regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants
26 are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of such
27 allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of
28 time, Pfizer marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States, including California, to

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in
2 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this
3 paragraph of the Complaint.

4 6. Defendants admit that Searle is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal
5 place of business in Illinois. Defendants admit that Pharmacia acquired Searle in 2000 and that,
6 as the result of a merger in April 2003, Searle and Pharmacia became subsidiaries of Pfizer.
7 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and
8 packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed
9 Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law
10 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny
11 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 7. Defendants admit that in 1933 an entity known as Monsanto Company (“1933
13 Monsanto”) was incorporated under the laws of Delaware. On March 31, 2000, a subsidiary of
14 1933 Monsanto merged with Pharmacia & Upjohn, Inc, and 1933 Monsanto changed its name
15 to Pharmacia Corporation. On February 9, 2000, a separate company, Monsanto Ag Company,
16 was incorporated under the laws of Delaware. On March 31, 2000, Monsanto Ag Company
17 changed its name to Monsanto Company (“2000 Monsanto”). The 2000 Monsanto is engaged
18 in the agricultural business and does not and has not ever manufactured, marketed, sold, or
19 distributed Celebrex®. The 2000 Monsanto is not and has never been the parent of either
20 Searle or Pharmacia. As the 2000 Monsanto does not and has not ever manufactured, marketed,
21 sold, or distributed Celebrex®, Defendants therefore state that the 2000 Monsanto is not a
22 proper party in this matter. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the
23 Complaint. Defendants state that the response to this paragraph of the Complaint regarding
24 Monsanto is incorporated by reference into Defendants’ responses to each and every paragraph
25 of the Complaint referring to Monsanto and/or Defendants.

26 8. Defendants admit that Pharmacia is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of
27 business in New Jersey. Defendants admit that Pharmacia acquired Searle in 2000 and that, as
28 the result of a merger in April 2003, Searle and Pharmacia became subsidiaries of Pfizer.

1 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted
2 Celebrex® in the United States, including California, to be prescribed by healthcare providers
3 who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA.
4 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 **Response to Allegations Regarding Jurisdiction and Venue**

6 9. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the
7 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the amount in controversy, and,
8 therefore, deny that the same. However, Defendants admit that Plaintiffs claim that the amount
9 in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

10 10. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the
11 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Plaintiffs' citizenship and the amount
12 in controversy, and, therefore, deny the same. However, Defendants admit that Plaintiffs claim
13 that the parties are diverse and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of
14 interests and costs.

15 11. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations
16 in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the judicial district in which the asserted claims
17 allegedly arose and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe
18 and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information.
19 Defendants deny committing a tort in the States of California, Washington, Mississippi, and
20 Montana, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 12. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed
22 and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who
23 are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA.
24 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and
25 packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed
26 Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law
27 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit
28 that Pfizer, Pharmacia, and Searle are registered to and do business in the State of California.

1 Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding “predecessors
2 in interest” are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information
3 sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same.
4 Defendants deny committing a tort in the States of California, Washington, Mississippi, and
5 Montana, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 **Response to Allegations Regarding Interdistrict Assignment**

7 13. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to
8 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants
9 admit that this case should be transferred to In re: Bextra and Celebrex Marketing, Sales Prac.
10 and Prods. Liab. Litig., MDL-1699, assigned to the Honorable Charles R. Breyer by the Judicial
11 Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on September 6, 2005.

12 **Response to Factual Allegations**

13 14. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
14 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
15 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
16 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
17 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
18 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
19 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
20 Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage and deny the remaining allegations in this
21 paragraph of the Complaint.

22 15. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
23 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
24 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that, in the ordinary case,
25 Celebrex® was expected to reach users and consumers without substantial change from the
26 time of sale. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27 16. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
28 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
2 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
3 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
4 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
5 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
6 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 17. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding
8 aspirin, naproxen, and ibuprofen are not directed toward Defendants, and, therefore, no
9 response is required. Defendants admit that Celebrex® is in a class of drugs that are, at times,
10 referred to as being non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (“NSAIDs”). Defendants deny the
11 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 18. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed
13 towards Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent that a response is
14 deemed required, Defendants state that Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the
15 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information
16 or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

17 19. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed
18 towards Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent that a response is
19 deemed required, Defendants state that Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the
20 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information
21 or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

22 19. Answering the second Paragraph 19 of the Complaint, Defendants state that the
23 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed towards Defendants and,
24 therefore, no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants
25 state that Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the
26 Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as
27 to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

28 20. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 towards Defendants and, therefore, no response is required. To the extent that a response is
2 deemed required, Defendants state that Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the
3 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information
4 or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.

5 21. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding “other
6 pharmaceutical companies” are not directed towards Defendants and, therefore, no response is
7 required. To the extent a response is deemed required, Defendants state that, as stated in the
8 FDA-approved labeling for Celebrex®, “[t]he mechanism of action of Celebrex is believed to
9 be due to inhibition of prostaglandin synthesis, primarily via inhibition of cyclooxygenase-2
10 (COX-2), and at therapeutic concentrations in humans, Celebrex does not inhibit the
11 cyclooxygenase-1 (COX-1) isoenzyme.” Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the
12 remaining allegations in this paragraph and Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or
13 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations and, therefore, deny the remaining
14 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

15 22. Defendants state that the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding
16 “predecessors in interest” are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or
17 information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny
18 the same. Defendants state that, as stated in the FDA-approved labeling for Celebrex®, “[t]he
19 mechanism of action of Celebrex is believed to be due to inhibition of prostaglandin synthesis,
20 primarily via inhibition of cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2), and at therapeutic concentrations in
21 humans, Celebrex does not inhibit the cyclooxygenase-1 (COX-1) isoenzyme.” Defendants
22 state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-
23 approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex®
24 were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at
25 all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny
26 any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27 23. Defendants admit that Searle submitted a New Drug Application (“NDA”) for
28 Celebrex® on June 29, 1998. Defendants admit that, on December 31, 1998, the FDA granted

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 approval of Celebrex® for the following indications: (1) for relief of the signs and symptoms of
2 osteoarthritis; and (2) for relief of the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis in adults.
3 Defendants admit that, on December 23, 1999, the FDA granted approval of Celebrex® to
4 reduce the number of adenomatous colorectal polyps in familial adenomatous polyposis
5 (“FAP”) as an adjunct to usual care (e.g. endoscopic surveillance surgery). Defendants deny
6 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 24. Defendants admit that Celebrex® was launched in February 1999. Defendants admit
8 that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted
9 Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law
10 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit
11 that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for Searle,
12 which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the United States
13 to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in
14 accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe
15 and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information.
16 Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its
17 FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
18 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
19 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 25. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
21 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
22 denied. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
23 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in
24 this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 26. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
26 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
27 denied. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
28 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 27. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
3 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
4 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
5 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
6 Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 28. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
9 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
11 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
12 the Complaint.

13 29. Defendants admit that a supplemental NDA for Celebrex® was submitted to the FDA
14 on June 12, 2000. Defendants assert that the submission speaks for itself and any attempt to
15 characterize it is denied. Defendants admit that a Medical Officer Review dated September 20,
16 2000, was completed by the FDA. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself
17 and respectfully refer the Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to
18 characterize the study is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
19 the Complaint.

20 30. Defendants state that the referenced Medical Officer Review speaks for itself and
21 respectfully refer the Court to the Medical Officer Review for its actual language and text. Any
22 attempt to characterize the Medical Officer Review is denied. Defendants state that the
23 referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court
24 to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language and text. Any attempt to
25 characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied. Defendants deny the remaining
26 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

27 31. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
28 Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 denied. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
2 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
3 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this
4 paragraph of the Complaint.

5 32. Defendants state that the referenced Medical Officer Review speaks for itself and
6 respectfully refer the Court to the Medical Officer Review for its actual language and text. Any
7 attempt to characterize the Medical Officer Review is denied. Defendants state that the
8 referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual
9 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the
10 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 33. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
12 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
13 denied. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this
14 paragraph of the Complaint.

15 34. Defendants state that the referenced articles speak for themselves and respectfully refer
16 the Court to the articles for their actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the
17 articles is denied. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully
18 refer the Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the
19 study is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 35. Defendants state that the referenced Medical Officer Review speaks for itself and
21 respectfully refer the Court to the Medical Officer Review for its actual language and text. Any
22 attempt to characterize the Medical Officer Review is denied. Defendants deny the remaining
23 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 36. Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the allegations concerning “Public
25 Citizen” in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or
26 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.
27 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 37. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is
2 denied. Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the allegations concerning “Public
3 Citizen” in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or
4 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.
5 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 38. Defendants admit that there was a clinical trial called APC. Defendants state that the
7 referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual
8 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the
9 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 39. Defendants admit that there was a clinical trial called APC. Defendants state that the
11 referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual
12 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the
13 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 40. Defendants state that the referenced Alert for Healthcare Professionals speaks for itself
15 and respectfully refer the Court to the Alert for Healthcare Professionals for its actual language
16 and text. Any attempt to characterize the Alert for Healthcare Professionals is denied.
17 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 41. Defendants state that the referenced Medical Officer Review speaks for itself and
19 respectfully refer the Court to the Medical Officer Review for its actual language and text. Any
20 attempt to characterize the Medical Officer Review is denied. Defendants deny the remaining
21 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 42. Defendants admit that there was a clinical trial called PreSAP. Plaintiffs fail to provide
23 the proper context for the allegations concerning “other Celebrex trials” contained in this
24 paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to
25 form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same. As for the
26 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding the PreSAP study, Defendants state
27 that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the study for its
28 actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is denied. Defendants deny the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 43. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
3 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
4 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 44. Plaintiffs fail to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the
6 Complaint regarding Merck and Vioxx® in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants
7 therefore lack sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such
8 allegations and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that the referenced studies speak for
9 themselves and respectfully refer the Court to the studies for their actual language and text.
10 Any attempt to characterize the studies is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in
11 this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 45. Defendants state that the referenced Medical Officer Review speaks for itself and
13 respectfully refer the Court to the Medical Officer Review for its actual language and text. Any
14 attempt to characterize the Medical Officer Review is denied. Defendants deny the remaining
15 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 46. Defendants state that allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx®
17 in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants, and therefore no
18 response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Plaintiffs fail to provide
19 the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Vioxx® in
20 this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack sufficient information or
21 knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and, therefore, deny the same.
22 Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to
23 the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is denied.
24 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 47. Defendants state that allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck
26 and Vioxx® in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants, and
27 therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Plaintiffs
28 fail to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 regarding Merck and Vioxx® in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack
2 sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and,
3 therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and
4 respectfully refer the Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to
5 characterize the study is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
6 the Complaint.

7 48. Defendants state that allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding Merck
8 and Vioxx® in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed toward Defendants, and
9 therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Plaintiffs
10 fail to provide the proper context for the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint
11 regarding Merck and Vioxx® in this paragraph of the Complaint. Defendants therefore lack
12 sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations and,
13 therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and
14 respectfully refer the Court to the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to
15 characterize the study is denied. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself
16 and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to
17 characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph
18 of the Complaint.

19 49. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
20 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants deny the allegations in this
21 paragraph of the Complaint.

22 50. Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully refer the
23 Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the article is
24 denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 51. Defendants state that allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint are not directed
26 toward Defendants, and therefore no response is required. To the extent that a response is
27 deemed required, Defendants state that the referenced article speaks for itself and respectfully
28 refer the Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 article is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 52. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 53. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
4 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
5 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
6 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
7 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® is defective, and deny the
8 remaining allegations contained in this paragraph of the Complaint.

9 54. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the allegations contained in this
10 paragraph of the Complaint.

11 55. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the allegations contained in this
12 paragraph of the Complaint.

13 56. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
15 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
17 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations contained in this
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 57. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
20 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
21 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
22 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
23 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
24 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
25 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
26 Celebrex® is unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
27 the Complaint.

28 58. Defendants admit that the FDA Division of Drug Marketing, Advertising, and

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Communications (“DDMAC”) sent a letter to Pfizer dated January 10, 2005. Defendants state
2 that the referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its
3 actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants admit
4 that the DDMAC sent a letter to Searle dated October 6, 1999. Defendants state that the
5 referenced letter speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to the letter for its actual
6 language and text. Any attempt to characterize the letter is denied. Defendants state that the
7 transcripts of the FDA Arthritis Drugs Advisory Committee hearings speak for themselves and
8 respectfully refer the Court to the transcripts for their actual language and text. Any attempt to
9 characterize the transcripts is denied. Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for
10 itself and respectfully refer the Court to the article for its actual language and text. Any attempt
11 to characterize the article is denied. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this
12 paragraph of the Complaint.

13 59. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
15 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
17 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-
18 promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by
19 law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants
20 admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for
21 Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the
22 United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe
23 drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining
24 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

25 60. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
26 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
27 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
28 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that Celebrex® is a prescription medication which is approved by the FDA for the following indications: (1) for relief of the signs and symptoms of osteoarthritis; (2) for relief of the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis in adults; (3) for the management of acute pain in adults; (4) for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhea; (5) to reduce the number of adenomatous colorectal polyps in familial adenomatous polyposis (FAP) as an adjunct to usual care (e.g., endoscopic surveillance surgery); (6) for relief of signs and symptoms of ankylosing spondylitis; and (7) for relief of the signs and symptoms of juvenile rheumatoid arthritis in patients two years of age and older. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

61. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants state that Plaintiffs' allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding "predecessors in interest" are vague and ambiguous. Defendants are without knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of such allegations, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® is defective, and deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

62. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
2 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-
3 promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by
4 law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants
5 admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for
6 Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the
7 United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe
8 drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining
9 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 63. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
11 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
12 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
13 which at all times was adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
14 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-
15 promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by
16 law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants
17 admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for
18 Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the
19 United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe
20 drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny the remaining
21 allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

22 64. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
23 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
24 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
25 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
26 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
27 the Complaint.

28 65. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
2 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
3 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
4 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
5 the Complaint.

6 66. Defendants deny the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 67. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
9 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
11 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
12 the Complaint.

13 68. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
14 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
15 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
16 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
17 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
18 the Complaint.

19 69. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
20 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
21 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
22 Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this
23 paragraph of the Complaint.

24 70. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
26 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
27 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
28 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® is defective, and deny the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

2 71. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
3 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
4 Celebrex® are and were adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
5 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
6 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
7 the Complaint.

8 72. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
9 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
10 Celebrex® are and were adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
11 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
12 Defendants state that the referenced study speaks for itself and respectfully refer the Court to
13 the study for its actual language and text. Any attempt to characterize the study is denied.
14 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
15 the Complaint.

16 73. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
17 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
18 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
19 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
20 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® are and were adequately described in its FDA-
21 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
22 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
23 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 **Response to First Cause of Action: Negligence**

25 74. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs'
26 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

27 75. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to
28 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such duties.
2 Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its
3 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
4 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
5 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
6 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
7 the Complaint.

8 76. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to
9 which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants
10 admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such duties.
11 Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its
12 FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
13 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
14 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
15 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
16 the Complaint

17 77. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
18 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
19 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
20 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
21 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
22 the Complaint, including all subparts.

23 78. Plaintiff's Complaint omits Paragraph 78.

24 79. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
25 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
26 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
27 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
28 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
2 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
3 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 80. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
5 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
6 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
7 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
8 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
9 the Complaint.

10 81. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
11 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
12 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
13 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
14 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
15 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
16 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
17 Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this
18 paragraph of the Complaint.

19 82. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
20 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
21 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
22 Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this
23 paragraph of the Complaint.

24 83. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
25 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 84. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
27 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.
28

Response to Second Cause of Action: Strict Liability

85. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

86. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants state that, in the ordinary case, Celebrex® was expected to reach users and consumers without substantial change from the time of sale. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

87. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

88. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny that Celebrex® is defective or unreasonably dangerous and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

89. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
2 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
3 Defendants deny that Celebrex® is defective or unreasonably dangerous and deny the
4 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

5 90. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
6 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
7 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
8 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
9 Defendants deny that Celebrex® is unreasonably dangerous and deny the remaining allegations
10 in this paragraph of the Complaint.

11 91. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
12 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
13 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
14 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
15 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
16 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
17 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
18 Celebrex® is defective, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the
19 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 92. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
21 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
22 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
23 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
24 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® is defective, and deny the
25 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 93. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
27 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
28 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
2 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
3 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
4 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
5 Celebrex® is defective, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the
6 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 94. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
8 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
9 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
10 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
11 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
12 the Complaint.

13 95. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
14 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
15 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
16 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
17 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
18 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
19 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
20 Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this
21 paragraph of the Complaint.

22 96. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
23 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
24 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
25 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
26 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
27 the Complaint.

28 97. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
2 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
3 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
4 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
5 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
6 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
7 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 98. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
9 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 99. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
11 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

12 100. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
13 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

14 **Response to Third Cause of Action: Breach of Express Warranty**

15 101. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs'
16 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

17 102. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
18 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
19 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
20 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
21 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
22 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
23 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved
24 prescribing information regarding Celebrex®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in
25 this paragraph of the Complaint.

26 103. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
27 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
28 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
2 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
3 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
4 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved
5 prescribing information regarding Celebrex®. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and
6 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

7 104. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding
8 Celebrex®. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this
9 paragraph of the Complaint.

10 105. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
11 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
12 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
13 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
14 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
15 the Complaint.

16 106. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
17 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
18 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
19 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
20 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
21 the Complaint.

22 107. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
23 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
24 Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that the potential effects of
25 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
26 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
27 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding
28 Celebrex®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

1 108. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
2 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

3 109. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
4 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

5 110. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
6 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

7 **Response to Fourth Cause of Action: Breach of Implied Warranty**

8 111. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs'
9 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

10 112. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed
11 and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who
12 are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA.
13 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and
14 packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed
15 Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law
16 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny
17 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

18 113. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
19 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
20 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
21 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
22 Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding
23 Celebrex®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 114. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
25 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
26 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
27 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
28 Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

115. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex®, and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants admit that they provided FDA-approved prescribing information regarding Celebrex®. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

116. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that, in the ordinary case, Celebrex® was expected to reach users and consumers without substantial change from the time of sale. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

117. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that they breached any warranty, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

118. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

119. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

120. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Response to Fifth Cause of Action: Fraudulent Misrepresentation and Concealment

121. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs' Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

122. Defendants state that this paragraph of the Complaint contains legal contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed required, Defendants admit that they had duties as are imposed by law but deny having breached such duties. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

123. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint, including all subparts.

124. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

125. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
2 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
3 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that
4 Celebrex® is defective or unreasonably dangerous, and deny the remaining allegations in this
5 paragraph of the Complaint.

6 126. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance
7 with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of
8 Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information,
9 which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law.
10 Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of
11 the Complaint.

12 127. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
13 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
14 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
15 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
16 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
17 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
18 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
19 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

20 128. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
21 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
22 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
23 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
24 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
25 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
26 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
27 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

28 129. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

1 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
2 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
3 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
4 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
5 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
6 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
7 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 130. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
9 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
10 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
11 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
12 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
13 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
14 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
15 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

16 131. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
17 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
18 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
19 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
20 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-
21 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
22 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
23 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

24 132. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
25 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
26 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and
27 effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants
28 state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-

1 approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with
2 applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the
3 remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

4 133. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
5 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

6 134. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
7 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

8 135. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or
9 damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

10 **Response to Sixth Cause of Action: Unjust Enrichment**

11 136. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to each paragraph of Plaintiffs'
12 Complaint as if fully set forth herein.

13 137. Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Pfizer and Pharmacia marketed
14 and co-promoted Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who
15 are by law authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA.
16 Defendants admit that, during certain periods of time, Celebrex® was manufactured and
17 packaged for Searle, which developed, tested, marketed, co-promoted and distributed
18 Celebrex® in the United States to be prescribed by healthcare providers who are by law
19 authorized to prescribe drugs in accordance with their approval by the FDA. Defendants deny
20 the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

21 138. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
22 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
23 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this
24 paragraph of the Complaint.

25 139. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the
26 truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used
27 Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in this
28 paragraph of the Complaint.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

140. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

141. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint regarding whether Plaintiffs used Celebrex® and, therefore, deny the same. Defendants state that Celebrex® was and is safe and effective when used in accordance with its FDA-approved prescribing information. Defendants state that the potential effects of Celebrex® were and are adequately described in its FDA-approved prescribing information, which was at all times adequate and comported with applicable standards of care and law. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

142. Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph of the Complaint.

Response to Prayer for Relief

Defendants deny any wrongful conduct, deny that Celebrex® caused Plaintiffs injury or damage, and deny the remaining allegations in paragraph of the Complaint headed “Prayer for Relief,” including all subparts.

III.

GENERAL DENIAL

Defendants deny all allegations and/or legal conclusions set forth in Plaintiffs’ Complaint that have not been previously admitted, denied, or explained.

IV.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Defendants reserve the right to rely upon any of the following or additional defenses to claims asserted by Plaintiffs to the extent that such defenses are supported by information developed through discovery or evidence at trial. Defendants affirmatively show that:

First Defense

1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

Second Defense

2. Celebrex® is a prescription medical product. The federal government has preempted the field of law applicable to the labeling and warning of prescription medical products. Defendants' labeling and warning of Celebrex® was at all times in compliance with applicable federal law. Plaintiffs' causes of action against Defendants, therefore, fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted; such claims, if allowed, would conflict with applicable federal law and violate the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.

Third Defense

3. At all relevant times, Defendants provided proper warnings, information and instructions for the drug in accordance with generally recognized and prevailing standards in existence at the time.

Fourth Defense

4. At all relevant times, Defendants' warnings and instructions with respect to the use of Celebrex® conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of knowledge at the time the drug was manufactured, marketed and distributed.

Fifth Defense

5. Plaintiffs' action is time-barred as it is filed outside of the time permitted by the applicable Statute of Limitations, and same is pled in full bar of any liability as to Defendants.

Sixth Defense

6. Plaintiffs' action is barred by the statute of repose.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Seventh Defense

7. Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants are barred to the extent Plaintiffs were contributorily negligent, actively negligent or otherwise failed to mitigate their damages, and any recovery by Plaintiffs should be diminished accordingly.

Eighth Defense

8. The proximate cause of the loss complained of by Plaintiffs is not due to any acts or omissions on the part of Defendants. Rather, said loss is due to the acts or omissions on the part of third parties unrelated to Defendants and for whose acts or omissions Defendants are not liable in any way.

Ninth Defense

9. The acts and/or omissions of unrelated third parties as alleged constituted independent, intervening causes for which Defendants cannot be liable.

Tenth Defense

10. Any injuries or expenses incurred by Plaintiffs were not caused by Celebrex®, but were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by an idiosyncratic reaction, operation of nature, or act of God.

Eleventh Defense

11. Defendants affirmatively deny that they violated any duty owed to Plaintiffs.

Twelfth Defense

12. A manufacturer has no duty to warn patients or the general public of any risk, contraindication, or adverse effect associated with the use of a prescription medical product. Rather, the law requires that all such warnings and appropriate information be given to the prescribing physician and the medical profession, which act as a "learned intermediary" in determining the use of the product. Celebrex® is a prescription medical product, available only on the order of a licensed physician. Celebrex® provided an adequate warning to Plaintiffs' treating and prescribing physicians.

Thirteenth Defense

13. The product at issue was not in a defective condition or unreasonably dangerous at the

1 time it left the control of the manufacturer or seller.

2 **Fourteenth Defense**

3 14. Celebrex® was at all times material to the Complaint reasonably safe and reasonably fit
4 for its intended use and the warnings and instructions accompanying Celebrex® at the time of
5 the occurrence of the injuries alleged by Plaintiffs were legally adequate for its approved
6 usages.

7 **Fifteenth Defense**

8 15. Plaintiffs' causes of action are barred in whole or in part by the lack of a defect as the
9 Celebrex® allegedly ingested by Plaintiffs was prepared in accordance with the applicable
10 standard of care.

11 **Sixteenth Defense**

12 16. Plaintiffs' alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of misuse or abnormal use of
13 the product Celebrex® after the product left the control of Defendants and any liability of
14 Defendants is therefore barred.

15 **Seventeenth Defense**

16 17. Plaintiffs' alleged damages were not caused by any failure to warn on the part of
17 Defendants.

18 **Eighteenth Defense**

19 18. Plaintiffs' alleged injuries/damages, if any, were the result of preexisting or subsequent
20 conditions unrelated to Celebrex®.

21 **Nineteenth Defense**

22 19. Plaintiffs knew or should have known of any risk associated with Celebrex®; therefore,
23 the doctrine of assumption of the risk bars or diminishes any recovery.

24 **Twentieth Defense**

25 20. Plaintiffs are barred from recovering against Defendants because Plaintiffs' claims are
26 preempted in accordance with the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution and by
27 the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetics Act, 21 U.S.C. § 301 et. seq.
28

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Twenty-first Defense

21. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part under the applicable state law because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue was subject to and received pre-market approval by the Food and Drug Administration under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

Twenty-second Defense

22. The manufacture, distribution and sale of the pharmaceutical product referred to in Plaintiffs' Complaint were at all times in compliance with all federal regulations and statutes, and Plaintiffs' causes of action are preempted.

Twenty-third Defense

23. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by the deference given to the primary jurisdiction of the Food and Drug Administration over the subject pharmaceutical product at issue under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

Twenty-fourth Defense

24. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because there is no private right of action concerning matters regulated by the Food and Drug Administration under applicable federal laws, regulations, and rules.

Twenty-fifth Defense

25. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because Defendants provided adequate "direction or warnings" as to the use of the subject pharmaceutical product within the meaning of Comment j to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

Twenty-sixth Defense

26. Plaintiffs' claims are barred or limited to a product liability failure to warn claim because Celebrex® is a prescription pharmaceutical drug and falls within the ambit of Restatement (Second) of Torts § 402A, Comment k.

Twenty-seventh Defense

27. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because the subject pharmaceutical product at issue "provides net benefits for a class of patients" within the meaning of Comment f to § 6 of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Twenty-eighth Defense

28. Plaintiffs' claims are barred under § 4, et seq., of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

Twenty-ninth Defense

29. To the extent that Plaintiffs are seeking punitive damages, Plaintiffs have failed to plead facts sufficient under the law to justify an award of punitive damages.

Thirtieth Defense

30. Defendants affirmatively aver that the imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate Defendants' rights to procedural due process under both the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Constitutions of the States of California, Washington, Mississippi, and Montana, and would additionally violate Defendants' rights to substantive due process under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Thirty-first Defense

31. Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages are barred, in whole or in part, by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

Thirty-second Defense

32. The imposition of punitive damages in this case would violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

Thirty-third Defense

33. Plaintiffs' punitive damage claims are preempted by federal law.

Thirty-fourth Defense

34. In the event that reliance was placed upon Defendants' nonconformance to an express representation, this action is barred as there was no reliance upon representations, if any, of Defendants.

Thirty-fifth Defense

35. Plaintiffs failed to provide Defendants with timely notice of any alleged nonconformance to any express representation.

Thirty-sixth Defense

36. To the extent that Plaintiffs' claims are based on a theory providing for liability without proof of causation, the claims violate Defendants' rights under the United States Constitution.

Thirty-seventh Defense

37. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, because the advertisements, if any, and labeling with respect to the subject pharmaceutical products were not false or misleading and, therefore, constitute protected commercial speech under the applicable provisions of the United States Constitution.

Thirty-eighth Defense

38. To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for the conduct which allegedly caused injuries asserted in the Complaint, punitive damages are barred or reduced by applicable law or statute or, in the alternative, are unconstitutional insofar as they violate the due process protections afforded by the United States Constitution, the excessive fines clause of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution, the Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution, and the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the United States Constitution, and applicable provisions of the Constitutions of the States of California, Washington, Mississippi, and Montana. Any law, statute, or other authority purporting to permit the recovery of punitive damages in this case is unconstitutional, facially and as applied, to the extent that, without limitation, it: (1) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to guide and restrain the jury's discretion in determining whether to award punitive damages and/or the amount, if any; (2) is void for vagueness in that it failed to provide adequate advance notice as to what conduct will result in punitive damages; (3) permits recovery of punitive damages based on out-of-state conduct, conduct that complied with applicable law, or conduct that was not directed, or did not proximately cause harm, to Plaintiffs; (4) permits recovery of punitive damages in an amount that is not both reasonable and proportionate to the amount of harm, if any, to Plaintiffs and to the amount of compensatory damages, if any; (5) permits jury consideration of net worth or other financial information relating to Defendants; (6) lacks constitutionally sufficient standards to be applied by the trial court in post-verdict review of any punitive damages awards; (7) lacks

1 constitutionally sufficient standards for appellate review of punitive damages awards; and (8)
2 otherwise fails to satisfy Supreme Court precedent, including, without limitation, *Pacific*
3 *Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Haslip*, 499 U.S. 1 (1991), *TXO Production Corp. v. Alliance Resources,*
4 *Inc.*, 509 U.S. 443 (1993); *BMW of North America, Inc. v. Gore*, 519 U.S. 559 (1996); and *State*
5 *Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 538 U.S. 408 (2003).

6 **Thirty-ninth Defense**

7 39. The methods, standards, and techniques utilized with respect to the manufacture, design,
8 and marketing of Celebrex®, if any, used in this case, included adequate warnings and
9 instructions with respect to the product's use in the package insert and other literature, and
10 conformed to the generally recognized, reasonably available, and reliable state of the
11 knowledge at the time the product was marketed.

12 **Fortieth Defense**

13 40. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because Celebrex® was designed,
14 tested, manufactured and labeled in accordance with the state-of-the-art industry standards
15 existing at the time of the sale.

16 **Forty-first Defense**

17 41. If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon
18 information and belief, such injuries and losses were caused by the actions of persons not
19 having real or apparent authority to take said actions on behalf of Defendants and over whom
20 Defendants had no control and for whom Defendants may not be held accountable.

21 **Forty-second Defense**

22 42. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex®
23 was not unreasonably dangerous or defective, was suitable for the purpose for which it was
24 intended, and was distributed with adequate and sufficient warnings.

25 **Forty-third Defense**

26 43. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the equitable doctrines of laches,
27 waiver, and/or estoppel.

28

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

Forty-fourth Defense

44. Plaintiffs' claims are barred because Plaintiffs' injuries, if any, were the result of the pre-existing and/or unrelated medical, genetic and/or environmental conditions, diseases or illnesses, subsequent medical conditions or natural courses of conditions of Plaintiffs, and were independent of or far removed from Defendants' conduct.

Forty-fifth Defense

45. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex® did not proximately cause injuries or damages to Plaintiffs.

Forty-sixth Defense

46. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Plaintiffs did not incur any ascertainable loss as a result of Defendants' conduct.

Forty-seventh Defense

47. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because the manufacturing, labeling, packaging, and any advertising of the product complied with the applicable codes, standards and regulations established, adopted, promulgated or approved by any applicable regulatory body, including but not limited to the United States, any state, and any agency thereof.

Forty-eighth Defense

48. The claims must be dismissed because Plaintiffs would have taken Celebrex® even if the product labeling contained the information that Plaintiffs contend should have been provided.

Forty-ninth Defense

49. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred because the utility of Celebrex® outweighed its risks.

Fiftieth Defense

50. Plaintiffs' damages, if any, are barred or limited by the payments received from collateral sources.

Fifty-first Defense

51. Defendants' liability, if any, can only be determined after the percentages of responsibility of all persons who caused or contributed toward Plaintiffs' alleged damages, if any, are determined. Defendants seek an adjudication of the percentage of fault of the claimants and each and every other person whose fault could have contributed to the alleged injuries and damages, if any, of Plaintiffs.

Fifty-second Defense

52. Plaintiffs' claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the doctrine of abstention in that the common law gives deference to discretionary actions by the United States Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

Fifty-third Defense

53. The claims asserted in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, because Celebrex® is comprehensively regulated by the FDA pursuant to the Federal Food, Drug & Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. §§ 301 *et seq.*, and regulations promulgated there under, and Plaintiffs' claims conflict with the FDCA, with the regulations promulgated by FDA to implement the FDCA, with the purposes and objectives of the FDCA and FDA's implementing regulations, and with the specific determinations by FDA specifying the language that should be used in the labeling accompanying Celebrex®. Accordingly, Plaintiffs' claims are preempted by the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, Article VI, clause 2, and the laws of the United States.

Fifty-fourth Defense

54. Plaintiffs' misrepresentation allegations are not stated with the degree of particularity required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b) and should be dismissed.

Fifty-fifth Defense

55. Defendants state on information and belief that the Complaint and each purported cause of action contained therein is barred by the statutes of limitations contained in California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 335.1 and 338 and former § 340(3), and such other statutes of limitation as may apply.

Fifty-sixth Defense

56. Defendants state on information and belief that any injuries, losses, or damages suffered by Plaintiffs were proximately caused, in whole or in part, by the negligence or other actionable conduct of persons or entities other than Defendants. Therefore, Plaintiffs' recovery against Defendants, if any, should be reduced pursuant to California Civil Code § 1431.2.

Fifty-seventh Defense

57. To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of Defendants, no act or omission was oppressive, fraudulent, or malicious under California Civil Code § 3294, and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred. Any claim for punitive damages is also barred under California Civil Code § 3294(b).

Fifty-eighth Defense

58. Defendants plead the applicability of the Washington Products Liability Act, RCW 7.72 et seq., and specifically aver that Plaintiffs' common law claims are preempted by the statute and must be dismissed.

Fifty-ninth Defense

59. To the extent that Plaintiffs rely upon any theory of breach of warranty, Plaintiffs' claims are barred because Defendants did not make or breach any express or implied warranties, Plaintiffs failed to give reasonable notice to Defendants of any alleged breach or breaches of warranty as required by Miss. Code Ann § 75-2-607(3)(a).

Sixtieth Defense

60. Any verdict or judgment rendered against Defendants must be reduced under the laws of the State of Mississippi by those amounts which have been, or will, with reasonable certainty, replace or indemnify Plaintiffs, such as insurance, social security, worker's compensation, or employee benefits programs. Plaintiffs may have settled their claims for alleged injuries and damages with certain parties. Defendants therefore are, in any event, entitled to a credit in the amount of any such settlement heretofore made between Plaintiffs and any such parties.

Sixty-first Defense

61. Plaintiffs' claims for punitive damages are limited or barred by the standards governing

1 exemplary damage awards which arise under the United States Constitution and decisions of
2 the United States Supreme Court such as *BMW of North America v. Gore*, 116 U.S. 1589
3 (1996); *Cooper Industries, Inc., v. Leatherman Tool Group, Inc.*, 532 U.S. 424 (2001); and
4 *State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co. v. Campbell*, 123 S.Ct. 1513 (U.S. 2003), or the Mississippi
5 Constitution, statutes, and decisions of Mississippi courts.

6 **Sixty-second Defense**

7 62. Defendants assert that Plaintiffs' claim for punitive damages is governed and limited by
8 Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-65, and Defendants hereby plead and invoke the provisions of the
9 same.

10 **Sixty-third Defense**

11 63. Celebrex® and the Defendants' actions conformed to the state of the art medical and
12 scientific knowledge at all times relevant to this lawsuit and Celebrex® complied with
13 applicable product safety statutes and regulations as described in Restatement (Third) of Torts:
14 Products Liability § 4.

15 **Sixty-fourth Defense**

16 64. Defendants satisfied their duty to warn under the learned intermediary doctrine and
17 Plaintiffs' claims are therefore barred.

18 **Sixty-fifth Defense**

19 65. Defendants hereby plead all defenses contained in Miss. Code Ann. § 11-1-63 and
20 hereby invoke the provisions of Miss. Code Ann. § 85-5-7.

21 **Sixty-sixth Defense**

22 66. Plaintiffs failed to join all indispensable parties; as a result of such failure to join,
23 complete relief cannot be accorded to those already parties to the action and will result in
24 prejudice to Defendants in any possible future litigation.

25 **Sixty-seventh Defense**

26 67. Any judicially-created definitions of manufacturing defect and design defect, and
27 standards for determining whether there has been an actionable failure to ward, are
28 unconstitutional in that, among other things, they are void for vagueness and undue burden on

interstate commerce, as well as an impermissible effort to regulate in an area that previously has been preempted by the federal government.

Sixty-eighth Defense

68. To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of Defendants, no act or omission was oppressive, fraudulent, or malicious, and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred.

Sixty-ninth Defense

69. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because Plaintiffs lack standing to bring such claims.

Seventieth Defense

70. Defendants reserve the right to supplement their assertion of defenses as they continue with their factual investigation of Plaintiffs' claims.

V.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

1. That Plaintiffs take nothing from Defendants by reason of the Complaint;
2. That the Complaint be dismissed;
3. That Defendants be awarded their costs for this lawsuit;
4. That the trier of fact determine what percentage of the combined fault or other liability of all persons whose fault or other liability proximately caused Plaintiffs' alleged injuries, losses or damages is attributable to each person;
5. That any judgment for damages against Defendants in favor of Plaintiffs be no greater than an amount which equals their proportionate share, if any, of the total fault or other liability which proximately caused Plaintiffs' injuries and damages; and
6. That Defendants have such other and further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

1 April 2, 2008

GORDON & REES LLP

2
3 By: _____/s/_____

4 Stuart M. Gordon
5 sgordon@gordonrees.com
6 Embarcadero Center West
7 275 Battery Street, 20th Floor
8 San Francisco, CA 94111
9 Telephone: (415) 986-5900
10 Fax: (415) 986-8054

11 April 2, 2008

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

12 By: _____/s/_____

13 Michael C. Zellers
14 michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com
15 515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
16 Los Angeles, CA 90071
17 Telephone: (213) 430-3400
18 Fax: (213) 430-3409

19 Attorneys for Defendants
20 PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA
21 CORPORATION, and G.D. SEARLE
22 LLC
23
24
25
26
27
28

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111

JURY DEMAND

Defendants Pfizer Inc., Pharmacia Corporation, and G.D. Searle LLC hereby demand a trial by jury of all the facts and issues in this case pursuant to 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

April 2, 2008

GORDON & REES LLP

By: /s/
Stuart M. Gordon
sgordon@gordonrees.com
Embarcadero Center West
275 Battery Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 986-5900
Fax: (415) 986-8054

April 2, 2008

TUCKER ELLIS & WEST LLP

By: /s/
Michael C. Zellers
michael.zellers@tuckerellis.com
515 South Flower Street, Suite 4200
Los Angeles, CA 90071
Telephone: (213) 430-3400
Fax: (213) 430-3409

Attorneys for Defendants
PFIZER INC., PHARMACIA
CORPORATION, and G.D. SEARLE
LLC

Gordon & Rees, LLP
275 Battery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111